

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES OF CASES.

Is Harnessed Horse Running at Large?—While two horses, unhitched and unattended, but attached to a wagon, were standing near the curb consuming their midday meal, one of them resented the proximity of plaintiff and bit him. On the ground that the horses were running at large, the master, in the lower court, was held liable for their misdeeds. In Corcoran v. Kelly, 113 New York Supplement, 686, the Supreme Court of New York remarked that there was a wide difference between a horse permitted to roam at large and a work horse hitched to a wagon on the street eating oats. Negligence cannot be predicated on the mere leaving of a horse unattended in the street while it lunches at noon. Moreover, the viciousness of the animal, and not the absence of surveillance, was the proximate cause of the accident. Previous propensity of the horse to bite must have been proved by the plaintiff to permit a recovery by him.

Exhumation of Dead Body to Establish Controverted Fact.—In Gray v. State, 114 Southwestern Reporter, 635, it appeared that Gray and another man had engaged in an altercation which resulted in the death of the latter. The state contended that Gray shot from behind, while he insisted that he had shot in self-defense while deceased was advancing upon him with a drawn knife. There was a ragged bullet hole in the breast of deceased, which accused declared marked the entrance of the bullet, but which the state asserted indicated its exit. To settle this question accused endeavored to have the body exhumed and examined. If the bullet was in the body the defense would be greatly strengthened, and if it had passed through the evidence would be advantageous to the state. The court of Criminal Appeals of Texas decided that every consideration of respect for the dead would suggest that the pathetic dust of the deceased should remain undisturbed, unless justice required a disinterment, but in this case the examination was considered necessary for the protection of appellant.

Notice of Defect In Street.—The charter of a municipality provided that it would not be liable for injuries received through defects in its street, unless a notice of such defect were given 10 days before the injury. It would seem that the unfortunate, to recover, would have to anticipate his injury in order to notify the city in time. The Supreme Court of Minnesota, however, in Schigley v. City of Waseca, 118 Northwestern Reporter, 259, declared that provision entirely proper. It concluded that it is clear that the Legislature may grant or deny to individuals a right of action against municipal corporations for injuries resulting from the negligent manner in which streets and highways are maintained. Having this power, it may grant the right of action upon any conditions which it chooses to prescribe.